

REMARKS

This reply is in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed on March 8, 2007 in which Claims 6-9 and 17-19 were withdrawn and in which claims 1-5 were rejected. With this response, withdrawn claims 6-9 and 17-19 are canceled. Claims 1-5, as amended, overcome the rejections and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-5 under 35 USC 101

Section 2 of the Office Action rejected Claims 1-5 under 35 USC 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Office Action asserted that the claims do not recite that the modules are embodied in computer readable media.

In response, claim 1 is amended to further recite that the apparatus comprises software or hardware embodying computer readable instructions. Accordingly, claim 1, as amended, overcome the rejection under 35 USC 101.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-5 under 35 USC 102(e) based upon Blott

Section 3 of the Office Action rejected claims 1-5 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Blott et al. US Patent 6,449,618. Claims 1-5, as amended, overcome the rejection based upon Blott.

Claim 1 is amended to clarify that the originally claimed operation comprises a comparison. Examples of such an operation may be found in at least Paragraphs [062]-[0064]. Thus, no new matter is added.

Claim 1 is further amended to recite a transmit module which implements the comparison on the data content and communicates results of the comparison to subscribers.

Blott fails to disclose a transmit module that implements a comparison on data content and transmits result of the comparison to subscribers. In contrast, Blott appears to merely implement one or more internal operations or functions based upon operations and a subscription table. Blott does not appear to disclose (1) receiving requests for a comparison to be performed data content from a machine and also for (2) transmitting or communicating results of its operations back to subscribers referencing the same machine. Accordingly, claim number one come as amended, overcomes rejection based upon Blott. Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

III. Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-3815. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 50-3815. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 50-3815.

Respectfully submitted,

Date Sept. 10, 2007

RATHE PATENT & IP LAW
Customer No. 59,555
Telephone: (262) 478-9353
Facsimile: (262) 238-1469

By Todd A. Rathe

Todd A. Rathe
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,276